

Arkansas Teacher Retirement System
October 22, 2009

Monthly Benefit Payments to Retirees

July 2009

Gross Amount Benefits Paid	\$47,404,392.00
Net Amount Benefits Paid*	\$40,327,105.00

August 2009

Gross Amount Benefits Paid	\$47,565,297.00
Net Amount Benefits Paid*	\$40,487,805.00

September 2009

Gross Amount Benefits Paid	\$47,655,602.00
Net Amount Benefits Paid*	\$40,576,051.00

*Actual amount paid to retirees after deduction of taxes, insurance and other authorized reductions that are paid to others at the direction of the retiree.

T-DROP Benefits Paid July 2009 = \$64,700,000

Other Payment Benefits to Retirees

Death Benefits, Refunds, Residual, etc.

July 2009	\$5,312,638.00
August 2009	\$6,648,235.00
September 2009	\$5,844,450.00

Arkansas Teacher Retirement System

October 22, 2009

Allocated Positions, Salary and Separation

Comparison of first 9 months of 2008 to first 9 months of 2009

Number of Allocated Positions

82 Allocated Positions for 2008 (Fiscal Year 2009)
92 Allocated Positions for 2009 (Fiscal Year 2010)

Salary Paid (Including Extra Help Salaries)

Salary Paid 2008	\$2,316,106.45
Salary Paid 2009	\$2,541,723.24

Separation of Employment (Does not include Extra Help)

2008	5 Staff Members left ATRS (voluntary/involuntary)
2009	9 Staff Members left ATRS (voluntary/involuntary)

Arkansas Teacher Retirement System

Fact Sheet

October 22, 2009

Number of Participants

Active Members	*75,239
Inactive Vested Members	11,572
Retirees and Beneficiaries	30,324
Active T-DROP Participants	4,577

*Active member count includes part time or substitute teachers that are enrolled in ATRS but may not work during 2009-2010, or may not work enough to accrue service credit.

Retiree and Beneficiary Monthly Payout

September 2009	\$50,725,264
----------------	--------------

Actuarial Funding Value

June 30, 2005	80% Funded
June 30, 2006	80% Funded
June 30, 2007	85% Funded
June 30, 2008	85% Funded

Investment Returns

June 30, 2005	10.50%
June 30, 2006	12.40%
June 30, 2007	19.20%
June 30, 2008	-3.70%
June 30, 2009	-18.00%

Investment Assets

June 30, 2005	\$ 8,774,050,000.00
June 30, 2006	\$ 9,810,373,000.00
June 30, 2007	\$11,556,919,000.00
June 30, 2008	\$10,871,338,000.00
June 30, 2009	\$ 8,805,086,000.00
Sept. 30, 2009 Prelim	\$ 9,840,000,000.00

ARKANSAS TEACHER RETIREMENT SYSTEM

PRELIMINARY PERFORMANCE UPDATE

September 30, 2009

The attached financial returns are preliminary and do not include information from a couple of managers. These financial results do not reflect private equity or real estate because those returns are not yet available. Based on an 11.7% return for the quarter ending September 30, 2009, the total market value of the ATRS Trust fund is approximately \$9.84 billion.

ARKANSAS TEACHER RETIREMENT SYSTEM

PRELIMINARY PERFORMANCE UPDATE

September 30, 2009

RETURN SUMMARY ENDING 9/30/09

	Month	Third Quarter	Year-To-Date	1 Year Ending 9/30/09	3 Years Ending 9/30/09	Since Inception	Inception Date
Total Fund	3.6%	11.7%	17.7%	0.5%	0.7%	8.1%	3/31/86
Performance Benchmark	2.8	10.5	14.8	-1.4	-1.0	8.2	
Total U.S. Equity	5.3	17.6	30.4	1.8	-1.8	9.4	3/31/86
Dow Jones U.S. Total Stock Market Index	4.1	16.3	21.5	-6.2	-4.8	8.9	
Total Non-U.S. Equity	5.3	16.9	32.0	1.6	-2.1	6.5	6/30/93
MSCI All Country World ex- U.S. Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	-1.7	6.0	
Total Global Equity	5.3	16.9	32.0	1.6	—	-16.2	10/31/07
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	—	-16.8	
Total Fixed Income	2.2	8.5	20.9	12.6	5.7	5.8	6/30/92
Performance Benchmark	1.4	4.5	8.0	10.9	6.1	6.6	

RETURN SUMMARY
ENDING 9/30/09

	Month	Third Quarter	Year-To-Date	1 Year Ending 9/30/09	3 Years Ending 9/30/09	5 Years Ending 9/30/09	Since Inception	Inception Date
Oppenheimer Structured Alpha	4.7 %	18.6 %	--	--	--	--	28.6 %	4/30/09
S&P 500 Index	3.7	15.6	--	--	--	--	22.3	
ICC Capital Management	-6.1	4.2	9.4	-4.0	0.8	8.7	10.2	3/31/96
Performance Benchmark	4.2	16.3	21.2	-6.4	-5.0	1.6	5.8	
ING Investment Management	6.6	18.1	26.1	-5.8	0.3	5.2	4.7	3/31/99
Russell 2000 Growth Index	6.6	15.9	29.1	-6.3	-2.6	2.9	1.9	
Daruma Asset Management	9.1	21.8	34.1	-2.0	0.8	5.5	7.1	7/31/00
Russell 2000 Value Index	5.0	22.7	16.4	-12.6	-6.6	1.8	7.6	
Kennedy Capital Management	6.5	26.7	50.7	2.1	2.6	7.6	12.3	12/31/93
Russell 2000 Value Index	5.0	22.7	16.4	-12.6	-6.6	1.8	9.0	
Nicholas Applegate	5.0	15.1	31.7	12.8	5.1	7.8	8.8	11/30/98
Performance Benchmark	4.7	16.3	40.7	14.5	-0.7	2.1	5.4	
Jacobs Levy	4.5	17.2	20.8	-9.4	-6.7	--	-5.3	5/31/06
Performance Benchmark	4.2	16.3	21.2	-6.4	-3.5	--	-2.1	
Jacobs Levy 130/30	4.2	15.8	20.7	-9.2	--	--	-18.2	12/31/07
Russell 3000 Index	4.2	16.3	21.2	-6.4	--	--	-14.5	
Stephens	7.3	13.8	30.6	-2.9	-1.4	--	-0.4	7/31/06
Russell 2000 Growth Index	6.6	15.9	29.1	-6.3	-2.6	--	-1.4	
Relational Investors	2.1	14.9	24.5	-2.5	--	--	-10.0	5/31/08
Dow Jones U.S. Total Stock Market Index	4.1	16.3	21.5	-6.2	--	--	-16.5	
Pershing Square	4.8	12.5	24.3	5.8	--	--	5.0	6/30/08
Dow Jones U.S. Total Stock Market Index	4.1	16.3	21.5	-6.2	--	--	-11.7	
Wellington Global Perspectives	6.7	23.1	--	--	--	--	23.1	6/30/09
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	--	--	--	--	17.9	
Wellington Opportunistic	6.3	15.2	33.0	4.6	--	--	-14.8	10/31/07
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	--	--	-16.8	
UBS Global	5.9	20.2	48.2	13.4	--	--	-4.3	1/31/08
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	--	--	-11.9	
SSgA Global Index	4.8	18.4	30.7	1.3	--	--	-11.6	3/31/08
MSCI All Country World IMI	4.8	18.4	30.5	0.9	--	--	-11.7	
Capital Guardian Global	5.0	17.5	28.7	-0.5	--	--	-17.1	10/31/07
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	--	--	-16.8	
Knight Vinke	6.0	11.0	11.2	-14.9	--	--	-24.4	6/30/08
FTSE Europe Index	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
Lincoln Vale	3.3	6.5	4.6	1.6	--	--	1.6	9/30/08
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	--	--	-0.1	
Bedlam	4.3	12.8	--	--	--	--	9.6	5/31/09
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	--	--	--	--	17.2	
Lazard	5.4	3.0	--	--	--	--	5.4	8/31/09
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	--	--	--	--	4.6	
T. Rowe Price	3.9	14.5	39.1	7.6	-1.1	--	0.1	5/31/06
MSCI All Country World Index	4.6	17.9	28.7	-0.1	-3.2	--	-1.6	
BlackRock	1.6	6.6	12.7	12.3	6.0	5.1	5.0	9/30/03
Performance Benchmark	1.4	4.5	8.0	10.9	6.1	5.2	5.0	
BlackRock FGO	1.2	7.5	18.9	-3.4	--	--	-4.9	1/31/08
LIBOR	0.0	0.2	0.9	2.3	--	--	2.4	
PIMCO	1.8	7.4	15.0	16.2	8.6	6.6	6.3	9/30/03
Performance Benchmark	1.4	4.5	8.0	10.9	6.1	5.2	5.0	
PIMCO PARS II	1.3	6.9	27.5	14.3	--	--	4.5	1/31/08
1 Month LIBOR	0.0	0.1	0.3	1.1	--	--	1.7	
Western Asset	2.6	10.0	22.1	13.2	4.1	4.2	5.1	7/31/02
Performance Benchmark	1.4	4.5	8.0	10.9	6.1	5.2	5.4	
Western Absolute Return	3.1	10.7	28.3	15.7	--	--	3.2	1/31/08
LIBOR	0.0	0.2	0.9	2.3	--	--	2.4	
Loomis Sayles	5.2	14.7	39.5	31.2	--	--	17.0	8/31/08
Performance Benchmark	2.7	7.6	18.8	16.1	--	--	10.0	
Putnam	1.6	8.8	20.5	8.6	--	--	2.8	8/31/08
LIBOR	0.0	0.2	0.9	2.3	--	--	2.1	

OUTSIDE ACCOUNTING FIRM COMPARATIVE REPORT FY08-FY09

Assignment	DocumentNo	Type	Doc. Date	S	DD	Amount in local cur.	LCurr
70192541002008	7019254100	ZP	1/3/2008			12,592.50 USD	
70193806242008	7019380624	ZP	1/22/2008			7,822.50 USD	
70196522472008	7019652247	ZP	2/7/2008			2,300.00 USD	
70198505282008	7019850528	ZP	2/20/2008			7,315.00 USD	
70203430702008	7020343070	ZP	3/30/2008			760 USD	
70205939702008	7020593970	ZP	4/22/2008			14,900.00 USD	
70207388342008	7020738834	ZP	5/8/2008			3,171.25 USD	
70209312122008	7020931212	ZP	6/4/2008			3,220.00 USD	
70210941412008	7021094141	ZP	6/24/2008			3,350.00 USD	
70211872602009	7021187260	ZP	7/13/2008			42,646.25 USD	
70215772322009	7021577232	ZP	9/14/2008			1,000.00 USD	
TOTAL PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL 2008						99,077.50	
Assignment	DocumentNo	Type	Doc. Date	S	DD	Amount in local cur.	LCurr
70232362342009	7023236234	ZP	3/25/2009			4,133.75	
70234823402009	7023482340	ZP	4/14/2009			5,077.50	
						9,211.25	
TOTAL PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL 2009							
2008-2009 PERFORMANCE HAD A 90 PERCENT REDUCTION						-90.00%	

Employee Travel

Categories	2009	2008	Difference	
Registration Fees	1,400.00	9,325.18	-84.99%	Decreased
Common Carrier	-	15,031.24	N/A	Decreased
Lodging & Meals	27,946.18	42,345.75	-34.00%	Decreased
Taxi/Car Rental	-	1,752.02	N/A	Decreased
Parking	-	249.20	N/A	Decreased
Private Car Mileage	15,089.89	13,452.41	12.17%	Increased
Other Expenses	535.71	2,281.67	-76.52%	Decreased
Total Expenses	44,971.78	84,437.47	-46.74%	Decreased
Total Savings	39,465.69			

Summary

Increase in private car mileage expense: More of the Pre-Retirement counselors used their private vehicles instead of the state's.

Overall decrease in employee travel expenditures: Less out of state travel, which resulted in less airfare. Also, holding the yearly retreat at ATRS instead of 2008's Mountain Harbor resulted in a savings of roughly \$14,208.07 (This figure includes all staff and special guest expenditures).

Board Travel

Categories	2009	2008	Difference	
Registration Fees	4,500.00	2,100.00	114.29%	Increased
Common Carrier	3,155.09	3,298.01	-4.33%	Decreased
Lodging	8,541.21	15,291.62	-44.14%	Decreased
Meals	920.81	4,356.49	-78.86%	Decreased
Taxi/Car Rental	218.00	372.00	-41.40%	Decreased
Parking	147.47	195.76	-24.67%	Decreased
Private Car Mileage	4,683.52	7,046.46	-33.53%	Decreased
Other Expenses	1,806.63	-	N/A	Increased
Total Expenses	23,972.73	32,660.34	-26.60%	Decreased
Total Savings	8,687.61			

Summary

Increase in registration fee expense: In 2008, only 3 of the board members attended a conference or a workshop. In 2009, 5 of the board members attended a conference, one of which attended two conferences.

Increase of other expenses: Substitute teacher pay was reimbursed to Linda Parsons and baggage charges for trips to conferences.

Overall decrease in total amount expended for board members: The yearly retreat was held at ATRS instead of a resort like 2008's Mountain Harbor which resulted in a savings of roughly \$5,710.81 for board members only.

Issues Arising from Implementation of Act 743 of 2009

Act 743 of 2009 not only extended the termination period to 180 days before returning to employment for an ATRS covered employer for most retirees, it also required matching on all ATRS members: active, retired, and T-DROP. As part of the process for helping our employers identify retirees, ATRS has learned that some of our members have been working for colleges and universities for a number of years; one for as many as ten years. ATRS has identified eight retirees in a preliminary review that would owe ATRS \$489,276 if all benefits due under the earnings limitation were to be collected. There are probably others that have yet to be identified.

The eight retirees have been notified of ATRS' appeal process; whereby the member may request an Executive Director's "de novo" review of the pending matter, and during the review period, the member continues to receive ATRS retirement benefits. Without exception, the eight retirees have requested an Executive Director's review.

In September, several issues surfaced regarding the earnings limitation violations, in particular, Act 1293 of 1995 which exempted ATRS retirees from the ATRS earnings limitation if they returned to work in a position covered by a college, university or vocational technical school. Act 384 of 1997 repealed this act; however, many retirees who retired during the period July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1997 were told that the exemption would apply for life. To further complicate matters, there are a number of statutes applicable to public colleges and universities that allow employees to participate in ATRS only if the employee is a vested member of ATRS. There are further rules regarding part time employees not being eligible to participate in any state supported retirement plan.

A letter of clarification and request for legal assistance was requested of Arkansas' Attorney General, the Honorable Dustin McDaniel, to help ATRS sort through the complicated issues. During the time ATRS waits for assistance with these matters, the Executive Director reviews have been suspended for the Earnings Limitation issues, and monthly benefits have been reinstated for the eight retirees.

ATRS has reviewed four termination requirement cases for retirees who retired on or after 7/1/2009. Three of the cases were found to be favorable to the retiree due to the proper termination period being observed. One of the cases was found to be unfavorable to the retiree. Two additional retirees have been identified with retirement dates prior to July 1, 2009 that failed to meet termination requirements in effect prior to July 1, 2009. These cases are also awaiting the Attorney General's review of the college issues, and the retirees are continuing to draw monthly benefits during the interim. The total amount ATRS stands to collect from the three retirees who failed to meet ATRS' termination requirements is \$735,225.

Another issue has surfaced while implementing Act 743, and that is the APERS retirees who became eligible to join ATRS and earn separate retirement credit under Act 325 of 1999. Some employers immediately enrolled the APERS retirees in ATRS when applicable, and other did not. ATRS will be billing 50 to 100 APERS retirees (if contributory) and employers for service earned in ATRS covered position beginning July 1, 1999 and forward.

Also ATRS is still determining the number of ATRS retirees working for ATRS employers. At the current time, ATRS has identified 3,155 retirees working for ATRS employers. As the membership audit by ATRS staff continues, that number will rise. Now ATRS employers must pay a 14% contribution rate on ATRS retirees.

In This Issue

The severe decline in the financial markets has resulted in significantly higher contribution rates for many public plans at a time when sponsoring governments are under substantial fiscal stress.

As a result, many governments are looking for strategies to mitigate this impact by managing contribution rates, changing benefits, or changing actuarial methods and assumptions.

This paper discusses the advantages and disadvantages of several approaches. However, care should be taken to understand the downside of these strategies and their likely long-term impact on plan funding.

GRS Insight is published by Gabriel, Roeder, Smith & Company. The information provided is not intended as legal, income tax, or investment advice or opinion. Articles attributed to individuals do not necessarily reflect the views of GRS as an organization.

Preserving Financially Sound Defined Benefit Pensions in Challenging Market Environments

By Norm Jones and Paul Zorn¹

In 2008, the severe decline in the financial markets and subsequent downturn in the global economy resulted in investment declines for public pension plans averaging 25%.² This, in turn, affected the funded status of many public plans and produced substantial increases in contribution rates, which will likely continue over the next 3 to 5 years, at least. This puts additional budgetary pressures on state and local governments at a time when they face fiscal stress from declining revenues.

As a result, state and local governments are examining ways to mitigate the impact of the market decline on plan funded levels and contribution requirements. This article discusses the advantages and disadvantages of several approaches for defined benefit plans; however, it does not recommend any specific approach. The decision to make changes should only be made after careful analysis in light of the plan's circumstances and the related long-term impacts on the plan.

Changing Contributions

Employer (and often employee) contributions are made to pension plans to pay benefits and to accumulate investable assets. During a plan's initial start-up period, contributions are greater than paid benefits and there is a buildup of investable assets. When sufficient assets are accumulated, investment earnings become the largest contributor to most plans.³ However, when investment earnings are not sufficient to fund a large portion of promised benefits, either additional contributions must be made or the benefit program must be restructured.

Increasing Employer Contributions

Actuarially determined contribution rates are based on plan demographics and assumptions regarding the long-term expected investment returns on plan assets. If the actuarially determined contributions are not paid, investment returns will not be earned on the unpaid contributions. Unless future investment returns are

¹ Norm Jones is Chief Actuary and Paul Zorn is Director of Governmental Research at GRS.

² Standard & Poor's, "No Immediate Pension Hardship for State and Local Governments, But Plenty of Long-Term Worries," *RatingsDirect*, June 8, 2009.

³ According to U.S. Census Bureau data, public plan investment earnings constituted about 65% of the \$2.3 trillion in total public pension plan receipts over the period from 1978 to 2007.

higher than assumed, the unpaid contributions will have to be made up by future contributions, with interest.

If actuarially determined contributions are repeatedly unpaid, future contributions will grow rapidly. Consequently, increasing plan contribution requirements to ensure the plan is actuarially funded will, over the long term, reduce the employer's costs of providing benefits. Doing so also helps to ensure benefits will be paid which, in turn, helps to attract and retain qualified employees.

Increasing Employee Contributions

In most cases, public employees contribute to their pension plans. These contributions are usually made at a fixed percent of pay (e.g., 5%) and so do not vary as a result of investment performance. In a few cases, employee contributions are set as a percentage of total required contributions (e.g., 40%) and, consequently, vary from year to year as a result of investment performance or other gains and losses.

Increasing employee contributions can help to offset increases in employer contributions. However, if this is done, care should also be taken to ensure the change does not violate collective bargaining or other contractual agreements.⁴ It is also important that employee contributions do not become so unaffordable or so volatile as to put an undue strain on employees. Otherwise, it could be difficult for the sponsoring government to retain them.

Setting Thresholds on Contribution Increases

Given the recent severe market downturn and the corresponding fiscal stress on state and local governments, it may be difficult for some employers to make their full actuarially determined contributions. In these situations, some jurisdictions gradually phase-in the higher contributions by setting limits on changes in contribution rates (e.g., limited to 1% of payroll annually). This has the advantage of allowing more predictable contributions. However, a disadvantage is that it results in higher contributions being made over a longer period of time during market downturns. It also delays plan funding.

In addition, under governmental accounting standards, if the full annual required contribution (ARC) is not paid to the plan, the government sponsoring the plan must show a "net pension obligation" (NPO) as a liability in its financial statements. The NPO is the accumulated difference between

⁴ For example, in 1984, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania ruled that a statute requiring employees to contribute an additional 1.25% of earnings to their retirement plan without related benefit increases violated the contract clause of both the federal and state constitutions. See *Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties v. State System of Higher Education*, 505 Pa. 369, 479 A.2d 962 (1984).

the ARC and actual employer contributions to the plan, with interest. If the NPO grows too large, it could affect the government's credit rating and its ability to issue debt.

Changing Benefits

Under most state laws, accrued benefits may not be reduced once vested. As a result, efforts to control costs by changing benefits usually involves: changing ad hoc cost-of-living adjustments (i.e., non-guaranteed COLAs); changing benefits for newly hired employees; or changing benefits for current employees in some manner.

Delaying or Reducing Ad Hoc COLAs

Most public plans provide a COLA in order to protect retirees' purchasing power from inflation. In many cases, the COLA is automatic and set at some fixed rate (e.g., 3% annually) or based on the Consumer Price Index (e.g., 80% of the annual CPI increase). In other cases, the COLAs are ad hoc and granted by a decision of the plan's board of trustees. Because ad hoc COLAs are not part of the guaranteed benefit, they may be reduced or eliminated as circumstances warrant.

A disadvantage is that unless the ad hoc COLAs are granted consistently, retiree income may not keep pace with inflation. Consequently, if the COLAs are repeatedly delayed or discontinued, retirees will lose purchasing power.

Changing Benefits for Newly Hired Employees

Because public plans have evolved over time, many provide different levels of benefits (referred to as "tiers") for members hired at different dates. Generally this is done to help keep overall benefits affordable, especially during difficult market environments. Usually, a new tier is based on an older tier, with some or all of the following changes: (1) reductions in the benefit multiplier; (2) longer periods for determining final average earnings; (3) longer vesting periods; (4) increases in the age and service requirements for unreduced benefits; (5) increases in member contributions; and (6) reductions in retiree COLAs.

In some cases, new tiers are created that reflect an overall change in plan design which incorporates some form of gain and loss sharing. For example, hybrid plans combine features of defined benefit (DB) and defined contribution (DC) plans, usually in a way that provides members with a lifetime benefit from the DB plan based on a low benefit multiplier (e.g., 1%), combined with accumulated assets from the DC plan based on invested employee contributions.

Establishing a new tier gives governments some ability to control the cost of future benefits. However, a downside is that it may take many years before material reductions in

employer contributions emerge. In addition, a DC plan is not a retirement plan as much as it is a severance pay plan. As a result, it is much less likely that employees will be able to convert a DC account into meaningful lifetime income.

Adding Incentives to Delay Retirement

Rather than reducing benefits, another way to control plan costs is to encourage employees to delay retirement. Delaying retirement not only reduces the period over which the benefits are paid, it also allows more time over which plan contributions are made and investment income is earned. There are several ways to provide incentives for delayed retirement, including:

- Providing higher multipliers for longer service (e.g., service over 30 years);
- Offering deferred retirement option (DROP) plans with long DROP periods (e.g., 10 years); or
- Increasing the eligibility age for retiree health benefits.

Since these changes would not reduce accrued pension benefits for current employees, they could be applied to current as well as future employees. However, delaying retirement could work against employer efforts to control costs through workforce reductions. Moreover, cost savings from these measures could take a number of years to realize.

Changing Benefits for Current Employees

One way in which cost savings could be immediately realized is by changing benefits for current employees. However, to the extent accrued benefits are lowered, in some jurisdictions it would violate state statutory or constitutional provisions that protect members' benefits. To the extent benefit changes do not reduce accrued benefits, or are applied to non-vested members, in many plans it may be possible to make certain changes, including:

- Lowering or eliminating interest paid on refunds of employee contributions;
- Increasing the averaging period for determining final average earnings;
- Limiting items of compensation that may be used in determining final average earnings;
- Freezing benefit accruals so they are not affected by future pay increases; and,
- Lowering the benefit multiplier for future service.

However, such changes may be subject to court challenge. Moreover, it is possible the changes could affect the employer's ability to attract and retain qualified employees.

Changing Actuarial Methods and Assumptions

Actuarial methods and assumptions play a key role in determining a plan's funded status and contribution rates, but do not affect the long-term cost of the plan. The long-term cost of the plan is determined by the benefits promised and ultimately paid, and by the plan's experience.

To maintain the long-term solvency of the plan, the actuarial assumptions must reflect the best estimate of the plan's future experience. To ensure that the actuarial methods and assumptions are properly applied and reflect realistic expectations, the Actuarial Standards Board (ASB) establishes actuarial standards of practice (ASOPs). If actuaries do not adhere to these standards, they may be subject to disciplinary procedures. Perhaps more importantly, inter-generational equity with respect to plan costs could be severely disrupted if overly optimistic assumptions are adopted.

Generally, it is recommended that changes in methods or assumptions be considered only in conjunction with a full experience study. However, in a rapidly changing environment, temporary changes are sometimes justified.

Changing Wage Inflation Assumptions

The wage inflation assumption is a key assumption used in plan valuations. Because public pension benefits are most often based on final average earnings, higher wage inflation assumptions result in higher projected benefits. This, in turn, results in higher accrued liabilities and contributions (although the impact on contribution rates as a percent of projected payroll is less clear).

Generally, actuarial standards of practice require that economic assumptions (including wage inflation, price inflation, and investment returns) be consistent with one another.⁵ To the extent the current economic downturn is likely to reduce upward pressure on prices and wages for some years, a temporary reduction in the wage inflation assumption may be warranted in some cases when it is known that a pay freeze or pay reduction is in effect.

This could help to slow the growth of accrued liabilities and contributions. However, the recent federal economic stimulus legislation and the growing federal deficit could create future inflationary pressures in the economy. Consequently, the long-term outlook is unclear.

Changing the UAL Amortization Period

The difference between the plan's actuarial accrued liability (AAL) and actuarial value of assets (AVA) is referred to as

⁵ Actuarial Standards Board, ASOP No. 27, *Selection of Economic Assumptions for Measuring Pension Obligations*, Section 3.10.

the plan's unfunded accrued liability (UAL). This represents the difference between the present value of accrued benefits and the amount of assets that have been accumulated to pay for the benefits. The UAL is amortized over a period of time and included in the contribution rate.

The UAL can be amortized as a level dollar amount or as a level percent of covered payroll. In addition, the amortization period can be "open" or "closed." A closed amortization period declines each year; whereas, an open period remains the same each year – that is, each year's UAL is re-amortized over the same number of years. Many public plans amortize the UAL as a level percent of payroll over an open 30-year period.

Longer amortization periods result in smaller payments toward the UAL each year. Consequently, lengthening the amortization period can result in lower contribution rates, at least initially. However, doing so also extends the period needed to fund the promised benefits. Additionally, if the amortization period is extended beyond 30 years, governmental accounting standards generally require the plan sponsor to show the net pension obligation as a liability in its annual financial statements.⁶

Changing the Asset Smoothing Period

In order to dampen the impact of short-term investment gains and losses, most public plans "smooth" these gains and losses into the value of plan assets over a period of time. While smoothing does not prevent the gains and losses from ultimately being reflected in the contribution rates, it does moderate their impact on plan funded levels and contribution rates in a given year. Consequently, smoothing is useful for dampening the short-term impact of market fluctuations. Most public plans use a 3 to 5 year smoothing period, although some use longer periods.⁷

Under actuarial standards of practice, the recognized value of assets must bear a reasonable relationship to the corresponding market values and must fall within a reasonable range around the market values.⁸ If, in the actuary's professional judgment, the asset value is outside a reasonable range, the actuary is required to disclose this in the valuation report.

Lengthening the smoothing period increases the time over which investment gains and losses are recognized, and so lessens their impact on contribution rates in a given year. This

⁶ Governmental Accounting Standards Board, Statement No. 27, *Accounting for Pensions by State and Local Governmental Employers*, paragraphs 11-13. This rule applies to governments in single-employer and agent multiple-employer plans, but not to governments in cost-sharing multiple-employer plans.

⁷ Keith Brainard, *Public Fund Survey Summary of Findings FY 07*, p. 3.

⁸ Actuarial Standards Board, ASOP No. 44, *Selection and Use of Asset Valuation Methods for Pension Valuations*, Section 3.3.

also reduces the volatility in contribution rates. However, in declining markets, this has the disadvantage of extending the time needed to fund the plan. Another disadvantage is that excessive smoothing could result in an actuarial value of assets that is unrealistically different from the market value.

Adding or Changing Asset Value Corridors

In order to ensure asset smoothing does not result in unreasonable asset values, many plans have asset value corridors in addition to asset smoothing. Asset value corridors set an upper and lower limit on the extent to which the smoothed value of assets may differ from the market value. For example, a 20% corridor could be set so that the smoothed value of assets remains within 80% to 120% of the market value. Typically, when the smoothed value reaches the corridor limit, the portion in excess of the corridor is recognized immediately.

The key advantage to using asset value corridors is that the actuarial value of assets remains within a pre-determined range of the market value that is judged to be reasonable. A key disadvantage is that when the lower corridor boundary is reached in down markets, contribution rates may suddenly and substantially increase. In addition, during the period when the smoothed value of assets is outside of the corridor, it is subject to the same volatility as the market value and so may result in more volatile contribution requirements. In the current economic environment, some plans are temporarily widening their established corridor (e.g., from 20% to 30%).

Conclusions

The severe decline in the financial markets has resulted in significantly higher contribution rates for many public plans at a time when sponsoring governments are under substantial fiscal stress. As a result, many governments are examining strategies to mitigate this impact by managing contribution rates, changing benefits, or changing actuarial methods and assumptions. These efforts are useful to the extent they reduce short-term contribution rate volatility without jeopardizing the sustainability of the plans or the sufficiency of benefits.

However, care should be taken to understand the downside of these approaches and their likely long-term impact on plan funding. It is also essential to recognize that during difficult times there is often a divergence between the objectives of plan trustees and plan sponsors. In particular, while lowering the employer's contribution rate may be a short-term advantage to the employer, it is a disadvantage to the plan and potentially a long-term disadvantage to the employer as well. Unless future investment returns are higher than the expected return, the forgone contributions will have to be made up with interest. It is highly recommended that plans model the contribution patterns resulting from the mitigating strategies being considered, and test them under a variety of market conditions.

Table 1: Responding to Market Declines

These responses are presented for the purpose of discussion and are not intended as GRS recommendations.

Changes to Contributions			
Response	Advantages	Disadvantages	Examples
Increase employer contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Helps ensure future benefits will be paid May make it easier for employer to attract and retain qualified employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employer may not have the necessary funds Contributions may be set by statute 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase employer contributions to full ARC
Increase employee contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offsets employer contribution increases (degree depends on extent employee contributions are increased) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employees may not be able to afford increased contributions Employee contributions may be set by statute or collective bargaining agreements May make it difficult for the employer to attract and retain qualified employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase employee contributions from 5% to 6% of pay Employer no longer “picks-up” employee contributions
Set thresholds on increases in employer contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of sudden changes does not cause large increase in contribution rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The full ARC may not be contributed for many years, resulting in additional interest costs and NPO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit employer contribution increases to 1% of pay each year until reaching full ARC
Changes to Benefits			
Response	Advantages	Disadvantages	Examples
Delay or reduce ad hoc COLAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers employer contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retirement benefits may not keep pace with inflation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Postpone providing ad hoc COLA
Change benefits for new hires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers employer contribution rate (degree depends on extent benefits are reduced for new hires) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced employer contributions may take years to materialize Lower benefits may make it difficult for the employer to attract and retain qualified employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower multiplier, extend normal retirement age, increase average earnings period
Establish hybrid plan for new hires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers employer contribution rate (degree depends on extent benefits are reduced for new hires) Shifts some of the investment risk to members via the DC component 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced employer contributions may take years to materialize Lower benefits and added employee investment risk may make it difficult for the employer to attract and retain qualified employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a new tier for new hires with lower benefit multiplier combined with 401(a) DC plan
Add incentives to delay retirement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers ARC by postponing retirement age (degree depends on how many members postpone retirement and for how long) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delayed retirement may conflict with employer efforts to reduce workforce in difficult economic times 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a higher multiplier for 30+ years of service
Change benefits for current employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immediate reduction in liabilities and contributions (degree depends on specific plan changes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be subject to legal challenge May conflict with state constitution or statutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce interest on employee contribution refunds Lower future service multiplier from 2.0% to 1.5%
Changes to Actuarial Assumptions and Methods			
Response	Advantages	Disadvantages	Examples
Lower wage inflation assumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offsets impact of lower investment return Consistent with many economic forecasts over the foreseeable future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the economic stimulus, some think we are moving into an inflationary period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower wage inflation from 4.5% to 4%
Lengthen amortization period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers employer contribution rate (degree depends on how long amortization period is lengthened) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lengthens period needed to fund the plan Results in NPO if period is over 30 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase amortization period from 25 years to 30 years
Lengthen asset smoothing period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers employer contribution rate (degree depends on how long smoothing period is extended) Increases extent to which investment gains and losses are smoothed into the ARC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lengthens period needed to fund the plan Could result in misaligned smoothed and market asset values Higher ultimate contribution rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase asset smoothing period from 3 years to 5 years
Widen asset value corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowers employer contribution rate (at least temporarily) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lengthens period needed to fund the plan Contributions could increase suddenly when new corridor is reached Higher ultimate contribution rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widen asset value corridor from 90%-110% to 80%-120%

NCSL Updates Summary of State Pension and Retirement Legislation in 2009

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) recently updated its summary of state pension and retirement legislation in 2009. According to NCSL's Ron Snell, the principal legislative theme in 2009 was the need to make future pension costs manageable in the light of states' straitened fiscal circumstances and the enormous losses experienced by most retirement funds. Examples of legislative changes cited in the summary include:

- Nebraska and New Mexico increased state-sponsored retirement plan contribution rates for both employers and existing employees. New Hampshire and Texas increased contribution rates for newly hired employees. Texas also initiated employee contributions in a previously non-contributory plan.
- Nevada and Louisiana reduced post-retirement benefit increases for newly-hired employees. Louisiana also established an arrangement by which employees may, at their discretion, self-fund a 2.5% annual COLA through an actuarial reduction in benefits.
- New Mexico created new retirement plans for newly hired employees, with higher age and service requirements, and disincentives to retire before age 60. Rhode Island raised the retirement age from 60 to 62, provided a somewhat smaller benefit, reduced future annual benefit increases, and tightened disability eligibility requirements.

Many states are now in the process of studying their contribution rates and benefit structures. Consequently, more changes are likely.

The summary is available at: <http://www.ncsl.org/?tabid=17594>

Circular 230 Notice: Pursuant to regulations issued by the IRS, to the extent this communication concerns tax matters, it is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matter addressed within. Each taxpayer should seek advice based on the individual's circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

Gabriel, Roeder, Smith & Company has provided consulting and actuarial services for benefit plans since 1938. We are dedicated to providing services that encourage sound financing, sensible benefit design, efficient administration, and effective communication of employee benefits.

Since its inception, GRS has placed special emphasis on services to the public sector. From our network of offices, we serve over 700 clients nationwide, including retirement systems, employers, employee organizations, and government agencies. We have worked with many of our clients for more than 30 years - some for more than 60 years. The far-ranging locations of our clients and the long associations we have enjoyed reflect the quality of the services we provide. Services offered by GRS include:

- Pension Plan Consulting
- GASB 43/45 OPEB Consulting
- Health and Welfare Benefit Consulting
- Retirement Technology Applications

GRS Offices

CHICAGO

20 North Clark Street, Ste. 2400
Chicago, IL 60602-5111
(312) 456-9800
(312) 456-9801 Fax

Contact: Mike Kivi

DALLAS

5605 N. MacArthur Boulevard, Ste. 870
Irving, TX 75038-2631
(469) 524-0000
(469) 524-0003 Fax

Contact: Mark Randall

DENVER

7900 East Union Avenue, Ste. 1100
Denver, CO 80237-2746
(303) 217-7600
(303) 217-7609 Fax

Contact: Leslie Thompson

DETROIT

One Towne Square, Ste. 800
Southfield, MI 48076-3723
(800) 521-0498
(248) 799-9000
(248) 799-9020 Fax

Contact: Judy Kermans

FT. LAUDERDALE

One East Broward Boulevard, Ste. 505
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301-1827
(954) 527-1616
(954) 525-0083 Fax

Contact: Theora Braccialarghe

This newsletter and additional information about the firm may be found on the GRS website at:

www.gabrielroeder.com